

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-6 are *pending*. Claims 5-6 have previously *been withdrawn*. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 are *independent*. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended herein. Although these claims have been amended herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices, Applicants submit that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation application(s). Applicants submit that these new claims and/or claim amendments are supported throughout the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. By way of non-limiting example only, support for amendments to claims 1 and 3 can be found on page 9, lines 5-13 of the specification. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figures 2a and 2b, alleging that they "should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated." (Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 5). Applicants have provided a Replacement Sheet in which Figures 2a and 2b have been designated as "Prior Art." Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner's objections with respect to Figures 2a and 2b have been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Wakabayashi et al., EP Patent Publication No. 0474499 (hereinafter "Wakabayashi"). Applicants respectfully

traverse the rejection and submit that Wakabayashi does not discuss every element of the allegedly anticipated claims.

Although Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 3 to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, inter alia:

A palladium-plated lead finishing structure characterized in that Pd or a Pd alloy is plated to a thickness of not more than 0.3 μm only on the surface of a plurality of external connection terminals... and the surfaces of inner leads are plated with silver.

Applicants submit that Wakabayashi does not anticipate or render obvious at least these elements of independent claim 1. Specifically, Applicants note that Wakabayashi discusses having "the entire surface of the lead frame... coated with the film of Pd or Pd-alloy" (Wakabayashi, p. 2, line 21). This contrasts with the claimed "Pd or a Pd alloy [that] is plated... only on the surface of a plurality of external connection terminals" and "the surfaces of inner leads are plated with silver," as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

Although of different scope than claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over Wakabayashi for at least similar reasons as those discussed above identifying deficiencies in Wakabayashi with regard to independent claim 1. For example, claim 3 recites, inter alia:

A palladium-plated lead finishing structure characterized in that Pd or a Pd alloy is plated to a thickness of not more than 0.3 μm only on the surfaces of a plurality of external connection terminals... and the surfaces of inner leads are plated with silver.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least these claim elements from independent claim 3 are not anticipated by Wakabayashi. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

Further, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4, which are directly dependent from independent claims 1 and 3 respectively, are also not anticipated or rendered obvious by Wakabayashi for at least similar reasons as those discussed above identifying deficiencies in Wakabayashi with regard to independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

Conclusion

Consequently, the reference(s) cited by the office action do not result in the claimed invention, there was/is no motivation, basis and/or rationale for such a combination of references (i.e., cited references do not teach, read on, suggest, or result in the claimed invention(s)), and the claimed inventions are not admitted to be prior art. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the supporting remarks and claimed inventions, claims 1-4, all: overcome all rejections and/or objections as noted in the office action, are patentable over and discriminated from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants believe that the above remarks, which distinguish the claims over the cited reference(s), pertained only to noted claim element portions. These remarks are believed to be sufficient to overcome the prior art. While many other claim elements and/or bases for rejection were not discussed as they have been rendered moot based on the above amendments and/or remarks, Applicants assert that all such remaining and not discussed claim elements and/or bases for rejection, all, also are distinguished over the prior art and reserve the opportunity to more particularly traverse, remark and distinguish over any such remaining claim elements and/or bases for rejection at a later time should it become necessary. Further, any remarks that were made in response

to an Office Action objection and/or rejection as to any one claim element, and which may have been re-asserted as applying to another Office Action objection and/or rejection as to any other claim element(s), any such re-assertion of remarks is not meant to imply that there is commonality about the structure, functionality, means, operation, and/or scope of any of the claim elements, and no such commonality is admitted as a consequence of any such re-assertion of remarks. As such, Applicants do not concede that any claim elements have been anticipated and/or rendered obvious by any of the cited reference(s). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and/or objection(s), and allowance of all claims.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17314-018. In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized and requested to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17314-018.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of the application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

Dated: June 23, 2009

By: /Walter G. Hanchuk/
Walter G. Hanchuk
Registration No.: 35,179

Correspondence Address:

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile